



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

In a grammatical work like the one under discussion, in which the author follows an entirely new plan of arrangement, some attempt, at least, should be made to show where the new arrangement and the older and more familiar forms touch. The fact that practically no concessions to this natural demand are made by the author is responsible for much of the obscurity that mars his work. The least that could have been asked for in such a book would be a brief index of the familiar grammatical categories with references to the places in the grammar where they are treated, but not even this is furnished. Any grammarian is, of course, thoroly in sympathy with the invention of new terms and the setting up of new categories in the study of a new and peculiar form of speech, but familiar terms and categories should not be thrown overboard, as they are here, without good and sufficient reason, especially when the new terms and categories offer no special advantage over the old, or are in many cases decidedly inferior to them.

The grammatical analysis here given is probably not intended for practical use, and would certainly be almost useless as a handbook for beginners, but even as a scientific treatise it has failed to measure up to many of the chief requirements of such a piece of work. It can hardly be said to have filled the need, which certainly exists, of a *clear* presentation of the most important grammatical facts of the chief Philippine language. In spite of its evident and serious defects, however, the phonological material, the great number and variety of the examples, the word lists in the Morphology, and the number of novel points of view, will make the grammar a useful addition to the material at hand for the study of Tagalog.

To sum up briefly, Part I (Texts) and Part III (Vocabulary) are both first rate specimens of the class of linguistic writing which they exemplify. Part II (Grammar), however, representing an effort in the very field in which a man of the author's evident linguistic ability would be expected to shine, is disappointing; it is not in any sense a model Philippine grammar, and it will be useful to students of Tagalog chiefly for the new points of view it suggests, and as a store-house of linguistic raw material.

FRANK R. BLAKE.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

ETTORE BIGNONE: *I Poeti Filosofi della Grecia. Empedocle: Studio Critico. Traduzione e Commento delle Testimonianze e dei Frammenti.* Torino, Fratelli Bocca, 1916. Pp. xi + 688.

This elaborate study of Empedocles consists of two parts, of which the first (pp. 3-290) treats critically of Empedocles

the man and of his work, while the second (pp. 295-519) gives a translation, with abundant commentary, of the *testimonia* and fragmentary remains of the two works of the poet philosopher. There follow six appendices (pp. 521-676), indices, *addenda et corrigenda*, and a table of contents.

When the book was sent to me I hoped to make it the basis of a detailed study of Empedocles in the form of a review, and therefore deferred the notice which should otherwise have been more prompt. Inevitable distractions and duties have made it impossible to carry out my original purpose. Hence this apology.

It may be said at the outset that Signor Bignone has given us in this volume the best available study of Empedocles, a poet of no mean powers, a thinker at once bold and profound, and a man as picturesque and engaging in the breadth of his interests and activities as history affords. But the book is not equally excellent throughout. While the second part and the appendices are in the main conceived in the sober style of a scientific treatise, presenting the evidence with learning, care, and mature, if not infallible, judgment, the first part impresses the thoughtful reader as rather two ambitious both in style and in scope. Though unquestionably containing the results of very wide reading and much thought, it cannot be said to be generally sound; indeed, I have noted so many points at which our author has quite overreached himself, yielding to the allurements of ill-founded hypotheses and generalizations, that I find it difficult justly to appraise certain really brilliant observations made by the way. Our author has in fact essayed to paint in a complete and detailed background, setting in perspective all the predecessors of Empedocles, a task to which, as the result proves, he was by no means equal; and, like the Italian painter of the Sistine Madonna, he has sketched even the angel faces of those, like Plato, destined to be born in a later age. Who can take seriously his characterization of Plato as a true scion of the Ionian stock cultivated in the school of Socrates?

Plato had indeed an interest in Ionian science, as he appears to have had in every phase of Greek life and thought; and his keen intelligence rendered easy for him a sympathetic view of what the great Ionians of the sixth and fifth centuries had wrought and thought, as witness his Protagoras, Politicus, Timaeus, and Critias; but he toyed with their science, his heart being elsewhere in highlands of which they knew little and recked less. This criticism would be captious if it concerned only an *obiter dictum*; in reality it concerns the central theme of the book, for in the consideration of the historical background of Empedocles it is essential that one distinguish between the contributions of Ionia, which gave rise to history,

geography, geology, and cosmogony, and of Attica and the West, which created metaphysics, the higher mathematics, and cosmography, and added the mystic conception of the soul, without which Parmenides, Pythagoras, Socrates and Plato are unthinkable. Empedocles marks the crossing, but not the blending, of these alien currents of thought. In fact they never did fully blend: certainly not in Plato, not even in Aristotle. The biological works of the Stagirite, for example, show hardly a trace of his metaphysics. The former depended ultimately on the Ionians, the latter descended from Socrates. So alien was this Ionian science to the metaphysically minded, that the Academic and Peripatetic commentators of Aristotle never touched his biological and geographical treatises. How can one write a history of fifth century thought if one has not distinguished these currents and traced them back toward their sources?

When Signor Bignone speaks of mysticism, following the blind guidance of Joel's *Der Ursprung der Naturphilosophie aus dem Geiste der Mystik*, he seeks it where of all places it was least to be found, in Ionia; and with Joel, he seeks to explain sixth century mysticism by the derivative mystics of the Strassburg school. For so uncritical a method our author deserves censure instead of praise. Of course we are confronted by the enigmatic figure of Heraclitus; but on his thought our author has thrown little clear light. There is here a twilight zone which one must tread with caution. Perhaps we shall never be able fully to illuminate the 'dark' Heraclitus, but surely modern mysticism will help us little. Ancient tradition associates both Pythagoras and Heraclitus with mystery religions. There is more hope of help from that quarter when we shall have quite set aside the agnosticism fostered by Lobeck's *Aglaophamus* and made a really intelligent study of the subject. To that end work of no little promise is going forward.

Regarding the interpretation of Empedocles in detail, the most important criticisms of the conclusions set forth by our author I have anticipated in various publications. Of my *Qualitative Change in Pre-Socratic Philosophy* and *Περὶ Φύσεως* Signor Bignone has made abundant use; other articles printed in various places he has either not known or been unable to procure. Thus he would have found the question regarding the supposed inconsistency of Empedocles' views of the soul in his philosophical poem and in the *Καθ' ἑμμοί* discussed briefly but correctly, as I hold, in my review of Diès, *La Cycle Mystique* (*Journal of Philosophy, Psychology, and Scientific Methods*, vol. viii, pp. 106-108); problems common to Empedocles and Anaximander, in *Class. Philol.*, vol. vii, pp. 212-234; the background of the corpuscular theories of

Empedocles, Anaxagoras, and the Atomists in Harvard Studies in Class. Philol., vol. xxii, pp. 111-172.

Another study of mine, On Certain Fragments of the Pre-Socratics, Proc. Amer. Acad. of Arts and Sciences, vol. xlviii, pp. 681-734) escaped the attention of our author. In it I reverted to the subject of the *ψυχῇ* and *νόμα* of Empedocles and particularly to Emped. fr. 110 Diels (pp. 725-729). I am sure Signor Bignone would have accepted the general view taken of the fragment if he had known the article. I refer to it specially here in order to set right a minor point in the discussion and to add new illustrations of the thought which have come to my notice since the publication of the note.

The question relates chiefly to the words (l. 4 sq.) *αὐτὰ γὰρ αὔξει | ταῦτ' εἰς ἔθος ἕκαστον, ὅπη φύσις ἐστὶν ἑκάστω*. It is of course obvious that *ἔθος* is corrupt, and Diels has adopted the correction of Miller, reading *ἦθος* instead, but retains *αὔξει*, which is likewise corrupt. Regarding the latter it would seem, there can be no doubt that my emendation *ἄξει* must be accepted; and that is the point of cardinal importance. Instead of *ἔθος*, as I pointed out, one might have a choice between *ἦθος* and *ἔθνος*, between which I could not finally decide, although inclining slightly to favor *ἔθνος*. I cannot even now make a definitive choice between the two words, either of which would have been possible, and would have yielded the same general sense. In addition to the references there given for *ἔθνος* in the sense of 'kind', cp. Hippocr. *Περὶ φύσεων*, 6 (6. 96 L.) *ἔστιν δὲ διςσὰ ἔθνεα πυρετῶν* and *ibid.*, p. 98 L. *ἔθνη τινί, οὐ γὰρ πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσι τῶν ζώων κτλ.*, and Plato *Gorg.* 455 B. Of *ἦθος* in the sense of the local habitation of a tribe or race, whether of men or animals, Herodotus affords numerous examples, cited by Stein on 2. 142, 16. But when things go to their own places they likewise join their own kind; cp. Arist. *de Caelo* Δ 3, 310^a 33 *τὸ δ' εἰς τὸν αὐτοῦ τόπον φέρεσθαι ἕκαστον τὸ εἰς τὸ αὐτοῦ εἶδος ἐστὶ φέρεσθαι*. Hence the local designations often given to the emanations from the Godhead in the Gnostic systems, in which each being has its *οἰκείος τόπος*. As the Gospel of the Naasenes says of Jesus, *ἦδει γάρ, φησὶν, ἐξ ὁποίας φύσεως ἕκαστος τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἐστὶ καὶ ὅτι ἕκαστον αὐτῶν εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν φύσιν ἐλθεῖν ἀνάγκη* (Hippol., *Refut.* V, p. 152 K.). Their *φύσις* is their kind, defined by certain qualifications, being both the source from which the individual springs and the goal to which he tends. Thus we read *αἱ αἰσθήσεις τοῦ σώματος εἰς τὰς ἐαντῶν πηγὰς ἐπανερχονται μέρη γιγνόμεναι καὶ πάλιν συναριστάμεναι εἰς [τὰς] ἐνεργείας· καὶ ὁ θυμὸς καὶ ἡ ἐπιθυμία εἰς τὴν ἀλογον φύσιν χωρεῖ* (Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, p. 336. 7). This suggests a slight modification of my former interpretation of *ὅπη φύσις ἐστὶν ἑκάστω*, which I explained as meaning 'each after its kind'. Since *φύσις* includes both the kind and its station,

that loose rendering is not far from the poet's meaning; but if we have to choose between ἦθος and ἔθνος, with the former reading φύσις would mean the natural habitat, with the latter it would suggest the γένος or εἶδος that inhabits it.

Regarding the thought of the fragment as a whole one may note that it proceeds on the assumption of the affinity of like for like, which ancient psychology applied especially to the problem of cognition. The passage cited above from Reitzenstein's *Poimandres* rests on this assumption, as does Hippocr. *Περὶ τόπων τῶν κατὰ ἄνθρωπον*, I (6. 278 L.) quoted in my earlier discussion. This is only a special case of *κοινωνία* or *συμπάθεια*, as the Greeks variously called it; and for this notion Hippocr. *Περὶ γυναικείων* B 174 (8. 354 L.) uses the term *ὁμοεθνίη*. One who notes the usage of fifth century writers can have no doubt regarding the meaning of Empedocles nor of the correctness of my interpretation, which sets his words into relation with Lucret., ll. 400 sq. and ll. 1114 sq.

Besides a multitude of minor points on which one might differ from our author regarding the interpretation of Empedocles, there are several large problems raised by his attempt, in the appendices, to reconstruct the order of the extant fragments and to fix the stages of the cosmic cycle as described by the poet. The endeavor was worth the making, and Signor Bignone has advanced both questions; but one cannot accept his conclusions throughout, and space would fail us to debate the questions in detail.

Among the merits of the book is the wide acquaintance of the author with the literature of his subject. The important books are all known to him and he has made assiduous use of them. The periodical publications of European scholars also he knows; it is perhaps intelligible that much that has appeared in American journals should have escaped his notice. In general the proof-reading has been carefully done; but, especially in English titles, numerous slips occur, which American readers will readily correct for themselves. The general index seems to be quite general, omitting references to the authors of special treatises, but containing such to works of a literary character. This seems of a piece with the literary ambitions of our author in the first part of his book.

W. A. HEIDEL.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY.